Case 2:15-cr-20652-GCS-DRG ECF No. 1117 filed 07/19/18 PageID.10087 Page 1 of 73

MARK MAGIDSON, ESQ. JOHN THEIS, ESQ. On behalf of Arlandis Shy STEVEN SCHARG, ESO. On behalf of Keithon Porter To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact: Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 1067 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 962-1234 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 

INDEX Page Opening statement by Mr. Wechsler Opening statement by Mr. Spielfogel Opening statement by Mr. S. Scharg Opening statement by Mr. Feinberg Openings statement by Mr. Theis EXHBITS Identification\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_Offered Received  $\mathbf{N}$ N  $\mathbf{E}$ 

Detroit, Michigan 1 2 Tuesday, June 19, 2018 3 4 (Proceedings resume with jury at 10:56 a.m.) 5 6 7 THE COURT: You can take a seat first. We 8 will first hear from the government for its opening 9 statement. Mr. Wechsler. 10 MR. DALY: Before we proceed, the defense 11 would make a formal motion to sequester witnesses. 12 THE COURT: Yes, but for the case agent, the 13 other perspective witnesses should leave the courtroom. 14 MR. H. SCHARG: I'll join in on behalf of 15 Mr. Fisher. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. WECHSLER: If I could dim the lights for 18 the power point? 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. WECHSLER: I want to tell you a story 21 about a man named Johnny Jones. You will hear evidence 22 that when Johnny Jones was about 35 years of age, he moved 23 to an area of east Detroit, and when he moved to this 24 area, he had individuals knocking on his door, which is 25 all times of the day, morning and evening, and these

individuals wanted to buy drugs, and what he realized is that drug sales were taking place both on his property as well as the property next door. What he learned was that these drugs sales were taking place by an enterprise called the Seven Mile Bloods, and you will learn that one of those individual's name was Robert Brown.

He approached Mr. Brown, and he said Mr. Brown, I have kids. Please don't sell drugs on my property. Mr. Brown was initially was amenable to this. He understood. That didn't stand for very long.

You see, two other members of the gang, Jonathan Murphy, as well as Corey Bailey, didn't like that somebody was telling the Seven Mile Bloods what to do, and so initially after this conversation with Mr. Brown, Corey Bailey tried to jump -- tried to attack Johnny Jones in a store one day. After that, Robert Brown went up to Johnny Jones' wife and got into an argument with her at the house, and when Johnny found out about it, he went up to Robert Brown and tried to intervene. Robert Brown didn't like that, and neither did Jonathan Murphy.

You see, Robert Brown hit Johnny Jones, and Jonathan Murphy threatened Johnny Jones' life, showed him a gun, and pistol whipped him. He hit him in the head with the gun. Johnny called the police, and Jonathan Murphy and Robert Brown were arrested.

Shortly after that, a man named Devon McClure came up to the house and told Johnny's wife that there was a price on Johnny's head. There was money out there to attack Johnny Jones.

Johnny approached Robert Brown. He approached Devon McClure, and he said, look. Keep my family out of this. This is a beef that we have. This has nothing to do with my family.

Devon McClure went away that day, but shortly afterwards, Johnny Jones' house which shot up. Shot up. Shortly after that -- and keep in mind nobody was injured, thank God. Nobody in Johnny's family was injured. The kids were okay, everyone was fine -- but that was not enough, and shortly after that someone took a Molotov cocktail, a bottle filled with gasoline and a rag, set it on fire and threw it at Johnny Jones' house. It didn't break the window. Again, nobody was injured that day.

That was enough for Johnny. Johnny decided he had enough of the neighborhood after two years. He left.

This is all because Johnny Jones had the audacity to ask members of the Seven Mile Bloods to stop dealing drugs on his property and to stop talking to his children.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Justin Wechsler, Julie Finocchiaro, Mark Bilkovic, Tare Wigod. We are prosecutors in this case.

The story that I told you is just one incident involving the Seven Mile Bloods. You're going to hear a number of those incidents. You're going to hear a number of incidents from 2003 to 2016. At the end of all the evidence, we will present to you a number of charges. There will be a lot of charges.

The Judge will give you instructions about those charges, and you will follow those instructions. Nothing that I say, nothing that the defense says about the law controls. The only person that controls the law in this courtroom is Judge Steeh, and he will give you very specific instructions, but I do want to talk about one of the counts, racketeering conspiracy.

Now there are five elements of racketeering conspiracy. The first one is that the enterprise as alleged in the indictment, Seven Mile Bloods, existed.

Second, a particular defendant was associated with the Seven Mile Bloods.

Third, that a particular defendant knowingly agreed to conduct or participate directly or indirectly in the conduct of the Seven Mile Bloods.

Four, a particular defendant and at least one other co-conspirator agreed that the defendant or conspirator were engaged in a pattern of racketeering, that is, committed at least two acts of racketeering in

furtherance of the Seven Mile Bloods.

And finally, activities of the Seven Mile Bloods affected interstate or foreign commerce.

Let's break that down a little bit. When you hear of racketeering and you hear of RICO, you think of the Sopranos, you think of the old Italian mafia, you think of the Godfather. Let's cut through all of that. Let's talk about the elements and why racketeering conspiracy actually applies in this case.

An enterprise for racketeering is simply a group of people who share a common purpose, and have a relationship with each over a period of time long enough to achieve that purpose. That's all an enterprise is for purposes of racketeering. They share a purpose, they have a relationship with each other, and they have that relationship over a period of time to satisfy that purpose; in other words, it's just a team of people getting together, and continuously operating towards the same goal.

Now we're saying the Seven Mile Bloods are that enterprise. The purpose or goal of the Seven Mile Bloods enterprise is two-fold. We believe that one of those purposes, the theory that we have, is that first purpose or goal of this enterprise was to make money through the drug sales, to make money through selling drugs.

The second purpose is protection from other gangs, protection from rivals, protection from individuals who are not members of the Seven Mile Bloods.

The time period that we're going talk about is from 2003 to 2016 as I mentioned before. That's the period of time that we believe the Seven Mile Bloods existed for purposes of racketeering conspiracy.

The next element that I want to talk about briefly is what it means to be a member or associate of the Seven Mile Bloods. The element reads, a particular defendant was associated with the Seven Mile Bloods. Associated. Merely associated, and the importance of that I'll talk about in a few minutes.

One of the other elements says that a defendant and at least one conspirator engaged in or agreed that the defendant or conspirator would engage in a pattern of racketeering, that is, they would commit at least two racketeering acts in furtherance of the Seven Mile Bloods conspiracy.

Let's break that down very briefly. Congress made things very complicated. They often do. An act of racketeering for the purpose of this element is pretty simple. Let's take murder for example.

Murder on its own is a crime. You can be charged with murder. Congress decided for purposes of RICO, the

purpose of the racketeering conspiracy, murder if it takes place to further the enterprise, can be considered an act of racketeering, a racketeering act.

The same thing can be said for narcotic trafficking. You can be charged with solely narcotic trafficking. If that narcotic trafficking is in furtherance of the enterprise, that could be considered an act of racketeering.

So when we talk about this element, we're simply talking about two or more acts of racketeering that involved racketeering acts, two or more murders, two or more drug trafficking that furthers the enterprise.

Now the elements talks about a defendant and at least one other conspirator, they agreed that at least the defendant or a conspirator would engage in those racketeering acts, the murders, narcotic trafficking.

Because it can be a defendant or a conspirator, you're going to hear a lot about conspiratorial acts, acts that were committed by individuals not at these tables. We will present numerous times where these defendants committed racketeering acts, but we're also going to present evidence of times other conspirators of the Seven Mile Bloods also committed racketeering acts, because as the rule reads, these gentlemen are held liable for other acts carried out by my other members or associates of the

Seven Mile Bloods.

Finally, the element regarding interstate commerce simply means in order for the federal government to prosecute this case, there has to be some sort of jurisdictional hook. That simply comes from drugs or guns moving from one state to another. Pretty simple.

Everything that I will tell you right now is what the government -- is what the evidence will show.

Everything that I will talk about from here on out is what the evidence will show.

Let's get back to the Seven Mile Bloods. When we talk about the Seven Mile Bloods, you're going to learn that the investigation revealed that the Seven Mile Bloods claimed a territory. They claimed turf, and called that turf the Red Zone. You will learn that turf is on the east side of Detroit, and it goes from Seven Mile to Eight Mile, Gratiot to Kelly. That's their turf, and the reason they claim this turf is that the individuals, the associates, the members of the Seven Mile Bloods, they grew up there. That's their neighborhood. They were raised there together. They associated with each other in that neighborhood.

So let's talk about the beginning of the Seven

Mile Bloods. The picture on the power point is a picture
that was taken from a search warrant done of Devon

Patterson's house.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In approximately 2003, a precursor, sort of before the Seven Mile Bloods was formed. It was a precursor group, and it was individuals in the neighborhood, Michael Rogers, Devon Patterson, Jonathan Murphy, Julian Patterson, who is Devon's brother and Quincy Graham. Initially it included Anthony Lovejoy, and this group got together, and they got together to sell drugs. It was a It was before Seven Mile Bloods existed, but precursor. it was this precursor group that would later grow into the Seven Mile Bloods, and what they did in the Red Zone, they sold drugs out of trap houses. It is simply a vacant house. There are a lot of vacant houses in Detroit obviously. It was a vacant house they used to store drugs and sell drugs out of. So this precursor group is selling drugs, and they are selling drugs from roughly 2003 to 2005.

In 2005 they started expanding. They start recruiting other members. One of the individuals they recruit is Corey Bailey. Corey Bailey goes by the nickname Sonny or Cocaine Sonny. They recruit Devon McClure, who goes like Block or Ryder. They recruit Billy Arnold who goes by B-Man, Berenzo or Killa. These three men, Bailey, McClure and Arnold, they will become some of the most violent members of the Seven Mile Bloods, and

you'll hear about that later.

Around the same time period, approximately 2005, other individuals are recruited into this gang, Jeffrey Adams, Arlandis Shy, Jason Gill. Adams goes by Brick or Product. Shy goes by Grymee or Vil. Gill, Whytes or White Boy.

Additionally, two other members become part of this group, Robert Brown, goes by RO, Eugene Fisher, Fest or Fes. In this group, these eight individuals, they take what was the precursors, a bunch of guys in the neighborhood selling drugs, and they come up with the idea they are going to become the Seven Mile Bloods.

And so these individuals, Bailey, McClure, Arnold, Brown, Adams, Shy, Gill and Fisher, they become the heart of the Seven Mile Bloods, the nucellus for lack of a better word.

Now they are selling drugs in the neighborhood from 2003 to roughly 2007. They are selling drugs out of these trap houses. In 2007, Jason Gill, who goes by Whytes or White Boy, he comes up with a different idea. He has connections down in West Virginia, and he says, look. We can make money down in West Virginia.

So Jason Gill starts buying up loose prescription pills from individuals in Detroit, Roxicodone, oxycodone, Vicodin. Someone would be prescribed let's say 50 pills,

and they would only need 10. Jason would buy the other 40 for a price, and then he would transport them down to West Virginia and sell them for four, five, six times the price that he paid for the excess pills up in Detroit.

And so Jason Gill sets up other members in West Virginia. He sets up Murphy, Anthony Lovejoy, Quincy Graham, Devon Patterson. These guys start living down in West Virginia for periods of time, and they are running the SMB operation down there. They are living in houses down there. They are making sure the pills are coming in and sold, and the money is being transported back up to Detroit. So that's generally what happened out of West Virginia between 2007 and 2011.

They are making tons of money. You'll hear evidence that even without jobs, these guys become very sophisticated pills salesmen. They are selling thousands of pills at a time. They are making a lot of money. They are becoming more sophisticated.

In 2011, those four individuals that I talked about few seconds ago, they are taken over by new individuals that come in, Derrick Kennedy, aka Dip. Dip starts taking over the operation down in West Virginia.

You'll hear from Derrick Kennedy in this trial, Jerome Gooch, goes by the name ROM or Dada, he starts taking over the operations in West Virginia.

Now even though there are six individuals between 2007 and 2011 who are in effect living in West Virginia making sure the operation is going on, this is an all hands on deck situation for the Seven Mile Bloods. You see, it takes Seven Mile Bloods individuals up in Detroit to buy the pills. It takes Seven Mile Bloods members or associates to transport them down to West Virginia, members or associates sell them in West Virginia, Seven Mile Bloods members or associates to bring the money back up. It is an all hands on deck operation. And so while individuals like Lovejoy and Kennedy, they are living down in West Virginia because it is an all hands on deck situation, you see other members of the Seven Mile Bloods begin to get arrested in West Virginia, transporting drugs, bringing money back.

And so you will hear evidence of for example,
Corey Bailey, Robert Brown, Devon McClure, Arlandis Shy
Devon Patterson, they are getting arrested in West
Virginia, and they have either drugs, money or firearms on
them, but again, it is an all hands on deck SMB, Seven
Mile Bloods operation. So that's what happening between
2003 and 2011-2012. It starts out as this precursor
organization, comes into the Seven Mile Bloods, they then
deal in West Virginia, and that's generally what happening
with the Seven Mile Bloods between those years.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16

Now even though the Seven Mile Bloods are selling down in West Virginia, they are still the gang to be reckon with in Detroit. Now the Seven Mile Bloods are sort of like the Coca-Cola. The name Seven Mile Bloods is sort of the Coca-Cola of products. Coca-Cola has Diet Coke, Cherry Coke and Coca-Cola Classic. Seven Mile Bloods are somewhat the same set up. There are individuals within the enterprise that called them Seven Mile Bloods. That's the Coca-Cola of the company. are also individuals who go by different names, Ruthless Clan, SMB Juniors, The Kings, Hobsquad, 55. Those individuals, they may not call themselves Seven Mile Bloods, but they're still associated with the Seven Mile Bloods organization, and that's what I alluded to you earlier what it means to be associated versus full membership when we talked about those elements.

Now when we talk about the Seven Mile Bloods, one of the things that will come up often is the Number 55, 5-5, and the reason it comes up is because five is the number associated with the national gang the Bloods. Five is a number that is associated with the Bloods, and so a lot of times you'll see SMB, Seven Mile Bloods, SMB members or associates holding up a hand with a five to show who they are a part of, part of the Blood organization.

Additionally, you'll see tattoos, the red five pointed star. The five pointed star is associated with the Bloods, and so you'll see tattoos that are red with five points.

Now when we talk about the Seven Mile Bloods, what they will never do, they will never use the numbers four and six, and the reason why they will never use four or six is because four is associated with the Crips. That's one of their rivals, and so what they'll do is called dropping fours. Instead of holding up one hand with five fingers, they will drop four. It's a sign of disrespect of the rival gangs.

One of those rival gangs that is associated with the Crips can be found in east Detroit, and that's called the Hustle Boys. That's a rival to the SMB organization. The Hustle Boys go by the name 4-2, and the reason why the Hustle Boys go by 4-2, it is simply looking at a telephone, H is 4 and B on 2. For the same reason Seven Mile Bloods will often be referred to as 762 for the same reason, S is on the 7, M is on 6 and 2 has the B.

But the Hustle Boys are not the only rivals to the Seven Mile Bloods in east Detroit. They are rivals with a number of gangs. This is a Facebook post that was posted Jeffrey Adams. He a member of the Seven Mile Bloods, and he writes: Public Service Announcement. SMB, we dont

fuck wit teameast, new skool, hustlebumz, 220. We not cool its on site. When, i c "n's" we put in 2 much work 2 let da streetz down its not beef its personal so n" better strap dey seat beltz on an hope dey have a safe ride str8drop.

What Jeffrey Adams is doing here is first is letting anybody who reads it that he is a member of the Seven Mile Bloods. He's identifying the rival gangs to the Seven Mile Bloods on the east side of Detroit, such as Teameast, New School, Hustle Bums, Hustle Boys, and when he says str8drop, what he's saying is if any member of the Seven Mile Bloods comes across these individuals, they have to at least attack them. They are the rivals. Can't let that stand.

Just like that post that you saw, there's going to be numerous other posts. This is the Facebook generation. Seven Mile Bloods, they are no different. They like Facebook, Instagram, and they like videos, and they post significant numbers of social media to their website.

Now that's generally what's happening with the pills, the social media, the rival gangs. Let's talk about the violent side of the Seven Mile Bloods.

You're going to first hear about a murder on

June 7, 2006 of a man by the name of Cleo McDougal. He

was in fight with Robert Brown, and Robert Brown lost that

fight. To put it bluntly, he was beaten badly. He was kicked in the face three times. Very bloody face. Robert Brown has a reputation in the Seven Mile Bloods as a fighter. He has a reputation to uphold, and he doesn't want to lose to a small guy like Cleo McDougal, and so you're going to hear evidence that Robert Brown went back to the Red Zone, the area controlled by the Seven Mile Bloods, and he got an AK-47 that was being stored in a garage for any member or associate to use for general protection. He took that AK-47 out of the garage in the Red Zone that was stored there for any SMB member or associates to use for general protection against rival gangs or anyone else. And he got that AK-47. His face was bleeding. He said to Murphy, I want a ride. I'm going back to the scene, and they proceeded to drive off.

Anthony Lovejoy, who you will hear from in this trial, he was there when Brown came back with the bloody face. He was there when Brown picked up the AK-47. He was there when Brown and Murphy drove off. He will come in and tell you about that.

So Brown goes back to the location where Cleo McDougal lived, and he kicked down the door of McDougal's apartment, and he shoots McDougal in the head killing him instantly.

Now a man named Elroy Lucky Jones was not at all

lucky. Lucky Jones got convicted of this crime, and was convicted of the crime twice because of a defect in the first trial.

Lucky Jones was in prison for a number of years, and then a witness comes forward and says, you got the wrong guy. It was not Lucky Jones that committed that homicide. It was Robert Brown, and the witness who came forward was Jonathan Murphy. It was Jonathan Murphy who drove Robert Brown back to the homicide site where Brown killed McDougal.

At that point Brown gets investigated. The case is reopened, and the court vacates. They dismiss the judgment of conviction against Elroy Lucky Jones. He's released from prison. The investigation continues, and it turns out that it is Robert Brown who commits that homicide.

Well, Robert Brown doesn't like Jonathan Murphy, who goes by the name of Bleek, talking about him to law enforcement, and Robert Brown is a rapper. So he puts out an album. The name of the album is Betrayal. Stop Bleeking, and one of the lyrics on the Stop Bleeking album is the following: This "n" Bleek the cop so I gun him down 100 shots out of the chop gun him down. The shit aint goin to stop until I gun him down. You see, Robert Brown didn't like that Bleek had talked to the police.

You don't snitch on SMB.

Let's move on to one of the more recent violent acts. July 14, 2014. Billy Arnold, aka Killa, Berenzo, he has a parole appointment on the Detroit's west side. When he's at this parole appointment, he runs into almost literally members of the Hustle Boys, the main rival of the Seven Mile Bloods. Those individuals are Michael and Martez Davis who go by the name the Twins. They are referred to as the Twins, as well as Corey Crawford and Djuan Page, who goes by the name Neff.

So when Bailey (sic) runs into these Hustle Boys, calls his boys. Billy calls his gang. He places two calls to Corey Bailey, one to Robert Brown, one to Jerome Gooch, one to Quincy Graham and one to Devon McClure.

Corey Bailey -- let me back up. After the appointment where the Twins happened to be at the same place as Arnold, the Twins, as well as Crawford and Page drive off. At some point their car is shot up. Michael Davis is struck in the chest. He survives. Djuan Page is struck in the eye. He dies a short time later.

Now what you're not going to hear in this case is anything about a crime scene. You're not going to hear that the police or EMS responded to a particular crime, and the reason why is that when the individuals in the car that got shot up were struck, they kept driving. They

drove off, and they tried to reached help. Their car broke down after awhile, and when it was broken down, a civilian took them to the hospital. When they got to the hospital, the police are called because there were gunshot wounds, and they were uncooperative. They would not help out the police with uncovering of what happened.

What you will have evidence of is first off is the appointment that Billy Arnold had, the appointments that the Hustle Boys had, two calls from Billy Arnold to Corey Bailey, you'll have cell phone information that demonstrates that Corey Bailey traveled from the east side of Detroit to the west side where the appointment was, information that Arnold and Bailey traveled together, and you'll have information about the shootings.

What you will also have is testimony from Derrick Kennedy, a cooperator in this case, who will talk about the conversations that took place after this homicide.

Now let's go back to Djuan Page, the guy who was shot in the eye in that car. After he died, the Seven Mile Bloods come up with a rap, and they rap about shooting someone in the e-y-e. That's Djuan Page.

Because Djuan Page was murdered, his nickname was Neff and he was a respected member of the rival gang, and the rival gang 220, Hustle Boys, they get together, and they say, we're tired of SMB. They get together and form an

Instagram page, and the Instagram page becomes a hit list of sorts. It shows a bunch of members of the Seven Mile Bloods pictures, and it serves as a hit list for rival gangs of who they should take out start.

So you start to see a string of Seven Mile Bloods members or associates who are shot. Between August 2014 and March 22, 2015, five individuals of the Seven Mile Bloods on that hit list who end up getting shot. They all survive except for Jason Gill, who is murdered.

After Michael Rogers is shot on March 22, 2015, the Seven Mile Bloods, they come up with their own hit list. They come up with their own hit list where they post their own pictures of individuals that they want to go after, and one of the first pictures that they post is a picture of Djuan Page, Neff, who was struck in the eye and died shortly thereafter. That's one of the first pictures they post. But they also post another one that sort of keeps the score. They say: The score we up seven, and they start listing various individuals who over the years they've killed. One of individuals is Neff, Djuan Page, the one who was struck in the e-y-e.

Now in May 2015, a real gang war breaks out.

There was a gang war before, but now it is a real gang war. You see on May 21, 2015, Devon McClure, one of the founding members of the Seven Mile Bloods, and one of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

24

most revered and respected members, he's murdered. Devon McClure sets off a fire storm for lack of a better word.

One May 1, 2015, the night that Devon McClure is murdered, Ralpheal Carter is walking down the street with his two and four year old daughters. Ralpheal Carter appeared in a photograph of a rapper associated with a rival gang. Ralpheal Carter is walking down the street with his two and four year old when he sees a car approach, and that car has two individuals in it, and in almost a fortuitous chain of events, his daughters say, hey, dad. Let's play tag. He agrees and they run. As soon as they run, the car approaches, individual leans out of the driver's side -- I'm sorry -- the passenger side, and shoots Ralpheal Carter, paralyzing him instantly. His two and four year old are safe. Ralpheal Carter is paralyzed instantly. That was not enough. The individual in the car kept shooting and shooting at Ralpheal Carter seven more times. Now Ralpheal Carter, he survives. paralyzed, but he survives.

You will hear evidence that not only was Ralpheal Carter struck, but an elderly gentleman was sitting on his porch about four blocks away and was struck by a stray bullet. He also survived.

You will hear evidence that the individuals in the car that night were Billy Arnold and Keithon Porter. The

AR-15 that was used to strike Ralpheal Carter was stored by Eugene Fisher. You'll hear that the AR-15 that was used was stored by Eugene Fisher and later taken by Billy Arnold.

You will also hear that 000Bigblood -- that's the name of the SMB hit list -- had a posting that they posted fairly close after the shooting where they talked about Ralpheal Carter's shooting.

Let's move to May 8, 2015, seven days after Devon McClure is killed. On May 8, 2015, Matleah Scott, she was Devon McClure's girlfriend. Matleah Scott finds members of the Hustle Boys in a certain location, and she text messages Billy Arnold. She gives Billy the location of the Hustle Boys, and once they're armed at that location Keithon Porter, Billy Arnold and Arlandis Shy, they go out hunting. You'll hear cooperators say they used the word "hunting." They find a vehicle that contains the Hustle Boys. Devonte Roberts was shot and killed. Marquis Wicker and Darrio Roberts were shot, but they survive, but Devonte Roberts is murdered. Again the AR-15 that was used for that murder was stored by Eugene Fisher.

That 000Bigblood account that SMB uses as their rival hit list, posting appears. It says, Darrio Roberts, the one that was murdered. That posting says, he thought he was laughing. Got'em.

Let's move to May 10, 2015. On May 10, 2015,

Porter, Arnold and Brown, they come across the vehicle

with rival members again. In that car Darnell Canady,

Derrick Peterson and Jason Gaskin who left a relative's

house. It was Mother's Day. Porter, Arnold and Brown

find the vehicle, and shoot at it 62 times. Only Derrick

Peterson is struck, but survives. Again the AR-15 that

was used, stored by Eugene Fisher.

The fact that Darnell Canady survived that day couldn't stand. So the Seven Mile Bloods hear about a baby shower taking place for Darnell Canady's girlfriend Tiffany Settles, and they find this baby shower, and they approach it, and they shoot at the individuals in the parking lot. Darnell Canady was shot but survives. One of the individuals who was shot was a 15 year old, Anthony Bowen, his first day on the job.

That's generally the story and the evidence that we're going to talk about in the next several weeks.

We're going to talk about the drug dealing. We're going to talk about a gang that turns into a larger organization, and we're going to talk about the violence that comes along with it.

How are we going to prove this to you? First, we're going to try to keep it as chronological as possible. We will talk about the older stuff first and

build up towards the more recent stuff. Part of that is so you understand the formation of the organization and how it got bigger, and hopefully that will make it easier for you.

That will come in two caveats. The first caveat is that some of our witnesses have lives like everybody else, and they may not be able to come exactly when we want them, and so we have to go out of order just a little bit.

The second caveat is that the AR-15 that was used in those murders and attempted murders, we're going to talk about its recovery five months after it was first used, and when we talk about its recovery, first that's hopefully will give you context how it was used during the crimes.

You will hear from victims in this case. You will hear from Johnny Jones who I talked about initially. You will hear from Darnell Canady, and you will hear from other victims, from Anthony Bowen. You will hear from cooperators, from Derrick Kennedy, who was one of the individuals that was selling drugs in West Virginia, as well as Anthony Lovejoy. They will both come in and talk about both the drug dealing as well as violent acts that I talked about.

To talk about cooperators, let's just put

something on the table. Some of these individuals have done very bad things. Matleah Scott will come in, and she's going to tell you how she sent Billy Arnold text messages of the location of rival gang members. Some of the things these cooperators have done rival what some of these gentlemen have done. We don't expect you to like these cooperators. These cooperators have pled guilty to crimes. They've signed plea agreements with the government, and expect a benefit for testifying.

What we do expect you to do is take the evidence that they provide, compare it to other evidence, and decide for yourself whether or not you believe the cooperators.

We're going to bring in a number of law enforcement officials. They will talk about -- some of them will talk about very old acts, very old things from 2003, 2004, 2005. They are not going to remember anything about those acts. I want to be clear about that. They may have to rely solely on their police reports to talk about those acts.

The reason why we're going to bring in some of this older stuff is to show who was together at certain times, to show who was around drugs at certain times, and to corroborate the information that you're going to hear from these cooperators.

As I said, you're going to hear social media posts, just like the one Jeffrey Adams talked about when it came to rival gangs. You're going to see the hit lists. You will see photos and videos from phones that were seized from defendants.

You will hear rap lyrics. Now these rap lyrics -you're going to see videos -- these rap lyrics are not
just coming in because they are vulgar lyrics. They are
coming in because they will rival -- they will corroborate
real life events. You will hear them talking about e-y-e.
Other lyrics will come in because it corroborates real
life events. There is going to be some very vulgar
language. We will do our best to minimize it. At certain
points we will have to have the agent read some very
vulgar language into the record, but we will try to
minimize it.

You will see tattoos. These tattoos will demonstrate Seven Mile Bloods members or associates allegiance to the organization.

You will hear from forensic examiners. They will come in and talk about they analysis they did on ballistics casings that were recovered from crime scenes and matched it up to the AR-15.

You will see text messages like the one we talked about with Matleah Scott where she told Billy Arnold where

rival gangs were, and you will learn when we recovered a phone or recovered a phone number, we were able to go back to the phone company and gets what's called a cell phone data. We can take the cell phone towers and determine where an individual was at a certain location, a certain time based on the cell phone tower data.

Now the defendants are represented by very capable attorneys. They will do their best to tell you why the government has not made its case. We're confident that when you hear all of the evidence, and you see all the exhibits that we introduce, that you will find the defendants guilty of all the charges.

On behalf of United States of America, we thank you for your service in this case. We recognize the summer is not an idea time for this, but we thank you for this, and I appreciate you taking the time this morning.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wechsler.

On behalf of defendants, Mr. Spielfogel?

MR. SPIELFOGEL: Thank you, your Honor.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Keith Spielfogel. Together with Mr. Daly, we represent Corey Bailey.

Now the government has just come before you and told you that they are going to prove two things to you as far as Corey Bailey goes beyond a reasonable doubt. The

first thing that they said they will prove is that Corey Bailey joined a criminal enterprise, and I guess since they are going back to 2003-2004, he did this when he was about 15 years old.

The second thing they told you, and it may have been hard for you to glean this from what the prosecutor just said, but they accused him of having played a role in the Djuan Page shooting that occurred.

So the two things they will prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt is that an enterprised existed in this case, and Corey was involved in a shooting.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is our opportunity to tell you what we believe the evidence will show, and I want to start by saying to you that when the government says that they will prove these two things beyond a reasonable doubt, they are 100 percent wrong, and they are wrong for the most simple of reasons.

Number one, there is no criminal enterprise that exists in this case.

Number two, Corey Bailey had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with what happened to Djuan Page.

So here's what I want to do. First, I will talk to you about the nonexistence of the enterprise. Then I will talk to you about why that's important in this case in your deliberations. Then I will talk to you about the

Djuan Page situation that the prosecutor referred to, and then one other piece of information that he just referred to at the end here about rap videos, and what role they play in this case, okay? So let's start with the nonexistence of the criminal enterprise.

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence that you're going to hear is that this co-called enterprise had absolutely no hierarchy whatsoever. They will tell you there were no officers, no people who were assigned to do any assignments. There were no people who congregated together to do things in an official capacity. There were no people who had different responsibilities or doing anything. There was no hierarchy as you would expect in any enterprise that exists.

This whole thing about this RICO conspiracy, this was designed to go after the mafia. That's what this enterprise was created about, the whole RICO thing.

There's absolutely nothing in this case that you will see about an enterprise. They will talk about drugs sales.

There were drugs here and drugs there. You will see, ladies and gentlemen, there was no place where they kept a central place where you got your drugs, everyone in this supposed so-called enterprise went and got their drugs and distributed their drugs.

You will find out that not only was there not a

sharing of the profits, that this enterprise -- usually when you think of an enterprise as you should an organization -- you gather up all the profits and share the profits. Not only did they not share profits, they actually were in competition with each other. There were no donations. There were no dues. There were no set meetings. There were no initiations into this thing that they are calling an enterprise.

Now ladies and gentlemen, what you're going to see -- this is a precise meaning, and his Honor is going to tell you what that precise meaning of an enterprise is and he's going to tell you -- and actually let me back up a second.

When he tells you the law on an enterprise, you may very well hear from the government that, you know what? All of these things that Spielfogel is talking about, that these things have to exist as far as an enterprise, all of the things that I just mentioned, the Judge is going to tell you that they actually all don't have to exist, and you can still have an enterprise, and you know what? They are absolutely right.

You will not get a checklist at the end of the evidence that will say no hierarchy, no keeping of drugs, in competition with each other, no meeting, no initiations, no dues, no this, no that. You're not going

to get a checklist, and you're not going to underline it and say when you add all of this up, there is no enterprise.

But the part they will leave out on the issue of enterprise is that the fact -- and the Judge will tell you this -- the fact that those things don't exist, may be considered by you in determining whether or not an enterprise existed in this case, and he will further tell you -- and I want to get this exactly right -- he will further tell you that this so called enterprise had to have had enough organization so that its members operated in a coordinated manner in order to carry out the alleged common purpose of the group. That's what's he going to tell you what an enterprise is.

You're going to see, ladies and gentlemen, there is no organization here. It was not carried out in any kind of organized manner whatsoever. These people were to a large extent competing with each other, and certainly there was no common purpose to what we are dealing with here, and you know what's going to tell you that? Do you know what's going to make it so you have a reasonable doubt? The nonexistence of factors that he will ask you to adopt.

Let me tell you where an enterprise exists in this case. It exists in the attempt of the government to

take a group of young people -- and they were young.

We're going back to 03, 04, 05, whatever -- it's their attempt to take a group of young people who grew up in a neighborhood together. Some of these people, some of these young men were playing basketball together when they were in second grade wherever they could find a hoop somewhere in the -- and you will hear this term all the time -- in the Red Zone. These kids from the second grade, a lot of them knew each other.

The only place where the enterprise exists is in their attempt to take something that was designed for the mafia to put them altogether and to say let's bring them all into this courtroom, and we'll say they are an enterprise.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you something, Corey Bailey never joined an enterprise. Corey Bailey walked out of his home when he was a child, a young boy and saw what was going on on the streets, around his house in the Red Zone, and he saw what was going on on each and every -- just about every corner that he grew up around. This was a world he walked into.

You will learn that he walked into that world with a mother who died when he was eight years old, and he had absolutely no guidance, no one to help him navigate the streets that were right outside of his door. He

didn't join an enterprise. He joined in an attempt to simply survive in the world that was dealt to him.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I'm certain that he would have liked it to have been different. There's no doubt in my mind that he would have preferred to have grown up like in New Jersey where I grew up, and there's absolutely no question whatsoever that he doesn't want this life for his little boy, but I tell you this, ladies and gentlemen, so that you understand that the only place where an enterprise exists is in their words. He didn't join an enterprise. He walked out of this door and joined the world that he was in and attempted to survive, and he nothing whatsoever to do with an enterprise. They cannot prove an enterprise because an enterprise does not exist in this case.

Why is this important? Why is this important?
Why do I spend all of this time talking about an enterprise? Some of you know the answer for that because when I was talking to you in the beginning, I kept talking to you about the elements and I brought that up over and over. It's important because every single charge in this case involving Corey Bailey requires that they prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Corey Bailey was an enterprise, that the enterprise existed.

You'll see that in some of the instructions it

will list it right off the bat. The first thing will be you must find that an enterprise existed. In other things you will see -- it will say it was part of a racketeering activity. Whatever you see that word "racketeering", think enterprise because they have prove an enterprise in order to prove racketeering.

So really in one sense -- I hate to say this -- but in one sense your job will be made easier because once you have decided that the government has not proven an enterprise beyond a reasonable doubt, every accusation, every count that they've brought against Corey, the oath you took requires that you find him not guilty of those charges.

Now I know that's easy for me to say, but here's what I have to be concerned about. You have to be concerned about that you will hear a lot of other things in this case, and you heard already from the government a whole bunch of other things. So you may begin your deliberations and you say, you know what? You know what? I really heard a lot of stuff here, and I know they talked about this enterprise, and I know I have these instructions from the Judge, but you know what I think I will do? I will cut him a bit of a break on that. They met four of the five elements, but this one they didn't really meet it, but it's close enough. I'll cut the

government some slack. You want to know something? You are the jury. There's 16 of you sitting here. Eventually there will be 12 of you who will decide this case, and reality of the situation is that as I sit here, you could do that. You could actually do that. You could go back there and say, they have not proven that beyond a reasonable doubt. I don't like some of the other stuff. I'm going to find that an enterprise existed.

What can I say to you? The only thing that I can say to you is that forcing the government to prove every element beyond a reasonable doubt is the foundation of our criminal justice system, and to some of you I said this before in jury selection, in my years of doing this has convinced me that this is the greatest system of justice on the face of the earth. All I can tell you is that it would be wrong to do that. You are the jury.

Let's talk about this -- and the prosecutor spent very little time on it -- but let's talk about the Djuan Page situation, where I think they refer to Corey having something to do about it, but I want to get it out front.

The first thing is on that charge, they must prove that he was involved in that murder beyond a reasonable doubt, and his Honor is going to tell you what that means, and to some of you I read what that means, and

he will tell you that a reasonable doubt can't be based on -- it must be based on reason and common sense. It is not based on pure speculation. He will say that. The government will probably repeat that to you. He will then tell you that proof beyond a reasonable doubt must be proof that is so convincing, that you would not hesitate to rely and act on it in making the most important decisions in your own life.

In the Djuan Page shooting, I don't believe that they will call one eye witness that Corey had anything whatsoever to do with that shooting. That's my understanding at this point. They will not call one eye witness. So you're asking yourself, why in the world would he be charged with that murder when they have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt without calling one eye witness, and you got a little hint of the answer. The answer was something about cooperators. We got cooperating witnesses, and it was fair for them to say they have done terrible things, but they are cooperating witnesses.

Let me tell you what a cooperating witness is.

We can cut right through down to the core of it. A

cooperating witness is a person whose testimony has been
bought by the government. Plain and simple, and the
government hasn't paid for that testimony in cash. They

don't cut a check for \$20,000 to the witness or something like. That has been paid for in something that is far more precious than money. It's been paid for in freedom. People who are looking at life sentences, the government reduces it and says, we'll make a recommendation of 10 years, but you're free to argue for probation. A person who is looking at nine years, suddenly winds up with three years, and you will hear it over and over again. That's what a cooperating witness is.

I want to tell you that if they bring in any cooperating witness that has something of any kind of importance to say about Corey, let's go back to the framework of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. I say to you, if that person came to you and told you something, and you were asked to act and rely upon it in making the most mundane decisions in your life, the little ones, you wouldn't rely on them in making that kind of a decision, and what we are doing here in this courtroom, and what we will be doing for the next several weeks, is you will be called upon to make what I submit to you is one of the most important decisions in your life. The government will never prove beyond a reasonable doubt anything about Djuan Page.

There's one more thing that I have to talk to you about because he brought it up at the end, rap video.

Rap videos. Corey Bailey is a rapper. I actually listened to some of his albums. He's actually very good. Rap video. Rap music. What do they sing about? What do they rap about? They rap about things that are real. They rap about things that they imagine. They rap to build up their own street credit. The more street credit, the more they make themselves look big, the more hits they get on these rap videos. The more hits they get on it, the bigger they become, the more money they make.

The government has said that they will play the rap videos. You know when I think about it a little bit, when doing that, for these kids who grew up in that neighborhood, in the world they grew up in, you kind of had one of two dreams. If you weren't big enough or talent enough to dream about being in the NBA, a lot of young men dreamt about being famous through rap videos, and you will hear testimony from several witnesses that they too were rappers.

But the government has said, we're going to play these rap videos for you. They acknowledge to you that they are vulgar, there is racist language in them, there is sexist language in them. That's why in the questionnaire we asked you if you could still be objective if you heard that kind of language, and they will play this.

Well, the problem for me is that if they are going to play them, we will play them. We will play some of them to show you the context of what these rap videos are like. We will play some of the most famous rappers, people who won Grammy awards, people who have had million of hits to show you what that what these raps are that they are playing, they are taking it out of context, and what the real world of rap video is.

But I will tell you this, these rap videos have absolutely no place in this trial, and I will tell you this, if the government won't play them, I promise you that I won't subject you to listening to this vulgarity and everything else in them, but if they do, I am going to ask you, as I will with all the other evidence, to focus. It's not going to be easy, but we have to keep our focus on the two important things in this case: Have they proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of an enterprise? Have they proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Corey had anything whatsoever to do with Djuan Page?

We say to you that if you will do that, if you simply do that and focus on whether they met their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, you will sign the verdict forms as to Corey that simply indicate that the government has not met its burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and you will sign the verdict forms

finding him not guilty, and I thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Spielfogel.

Mr. Scharg?

MR. S. SCHARG: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

ALL JURORS: Good morning.

MR. S. SCHARG: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Steven Scharg, and I represent Keithon Porter, who seated at the end of the table.

As you know, there's three sides to every story. You already heard the prosecutor's theory of their case. You will hear the theory of my case, and then your job as jurors is to make the decision of whether these individuals -- and I'm talking especially to Mr. Porter -- whether he is guilty of these charges alleged by the government, and you will make this decision based on the evidence that you will hear from that witness stand.

You will hear that there had been -- or there will be almost 200 witnesses called by the government. You will hear that there's going to be possibly 500 exhibits presented be the government. However, remember when sitting here in this jury box and listening to all of these hundreds of witnesses, and listening to what exhibits are presented by the government, remember the key

principles that the Judge explained to you earlier today and last week: One, what I say, and what the government says is not evidence. The only evidence that you will have to decide is what you hear and what is shown to you from that witness stand.

Two, the presumption of innocence. As you're sitting here listening to these witnesses over and over and over, hundreds of people coming forward to talk about this case, remember the entire time that you're sitting here until time you go into the jury room, Mr. Porter is presumed innocent.

Burden of proof. We do not have to prove anything to you. I don't have to get up at the conclusion of the government's case and put on any witnesses if I feel they are not needed. The government has the burden of proof to prove that they are proving their case beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Porter did what they claim he did.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Wechsler got up in his opening statement and mentioned to you about an incident that happened on May 1, 2015. Before I get into the facts of that case, I think the evidence will show -- I want you to know that during the entire trial, you will not see Mr. Porter, Mr. Keithon Porter in any rap video. You're not going to see him in any Instagram text messages. You will not see him in any Facebook videos.

What you will hear, ladies and gentlemen, is that on May 1, 2015 as Mr. Wechsler told you on a street called Troester in the city of Detroit, I anticipate that the evidence is going to show to you that a person by the name

of Ralpheal Carter was walking with his two kids down the street. As he is approaching his family home on Troester

Street, I anticipate Mr. Carter will tell you that he, as

he is approaching the house, his kids are in front of him,

and I anticipate that you will hear that a vehicle was

observed coming down the street very slowly.

I anticipate that Mr. Carter will say that instantly he heard gunshots. His kids ran in terror. They ran to the house, and before Mr. Carter could get to the house, he is shot down. He laid down. As Mr. Wechsler told you he was down, and he was paralyzed.

As you know, I'm sure in every shooting in the city of Detroit the police come to the scene. The police were called. They did a thorough search of the neighborhood for who these individuals were that shot Mr. Carter and almost injured his children, and I anticipate that you will find out through this investigation that nobody saw Keithon Porter anywhere near the house on Troester Street that day.

I anticipate that you will hear from officers that arrived on the scene that they knocked on the neighbor's

doors to see if anyone had a video on their houses to see if they saw any description of anyone involved in the crime, and I anticipate you will hear that they have no witnesses as to who fired the shots that paralyzed Ralpheal Carter. No eyewitnesses were given to any Detroit Police Officer on that day nor to this day.

I also anticipate, ladies and gentlemen, that on May 8, 2015 as Mr. Wechsler told you, that on the streets of Duchess and Craft in the city of Detroit, there was another shooting, and as Mr. Wechsler told you there were a number of individuals who were there that day. One specifically was Devonte Roberts who was murdered.

Mr. Roberts was in a vehicle with three other people. I believe you will hear from the witnesses that Mr. Roberts was in the car with his brother Darrio. You're going to hear there was another driver by the name of Marquis Wicker. He was in the car with them, and another individual by the name of Jesse Ritchie.

I anticipate that you will hear that the evening that this happened, they were ambushed. These individuals were ambushed in their vehicle, and I anticipate that you will hear that there was possibly two individuals who were involved in the shooting. However, Detroit police officers were summoned to that area after they heard shots were fired, person was hurt. They came to the scene, and

they were not able to identify anyone, including Mr. Porter, a person who shot at these four individuals.

I anticipate, ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will show more than just that. You will hear information from the government I believe, and as Mr. Wechsler told you, they recovered cell phones during this entire investigation.

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that you will hear no evidence whatsoever that not one phone was recovered from Keithon Porter during this entire investigation of 2003 to 2018. They did not ever recover a cell phone from Keithon Porter's person that would tie him to this these two shootings on May 1st or May 8th of 2015.

As we also know from Mr. Wechsler and my co-counsels, that there are informants. You're probably wondering in your mind, if there are not any eyewitnesses, then how is Mr. Porter even here today? As you remember, we don't have to prove why he is here today. The government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he did something wrong.

I anticipate, ladies and gentlemen, that when you hear these witnesses, such as Derrick Kennedy, who is, I believe, one of their confidential informants, I anticipate that you will hear from Mr. Kennedy that he's

the person who threw Mr. Porter into this mess. I anticipate that you will hear that Mr. Kennedy really doesn't even know Mr. Porter at all. And I also anticipate that you will hear that Mr. Kennedy was not present on May 1, 2015 at the shooting on Troester Street. And I also anticipate you will hear that Mr. Kennedy was not present at the time of the shooting on May 8, 2015 on Duchess Street and Craft in the city of Detroit.

I believe you will hear that Mr. Kennedy had to come forward to the government and talk to them to get the deal that he wanted to get, to get him out of the situation that he was facing at the time, and you'll hear more about that during the trial.

I also anticipate that you will hear that when Mr. Kennedy met with the government and their agents about whatever he was talking about, that he did not voluntarily come forward and say that he knew who did the shooting on May 1st and May 8th. And what I mean by that, ladies and gentlemen, you would think that if a person was an eyewitness to a situation and trying to help somebody, they would immediately come to the police department and say, look. I have information to give you. I know who did the shooting on such and such a date.

I anticipate that you will hear from Mr. Kennedy that didn't happen on his part. That didn't happen. He

didn't come to the police to tell them what happened or who did the shooting here on May 1st or May 8th, but it's when he wanted the deal, he made the suggestion after he could work out his own deal for what's best for Mr. Kennedy.

So I anticipate, ladies and gentlemen, at the conclusion of this case, you will find that there really isn't any evidence against Mr. Porter. I anticipate that you will hear from that witness stand that there's, by the government, they will try to present to you that there is phone records that will show that Mr. Porter was near the shooting scenes, when Mr. Carter was shot, and when the individual Mr. Roberts was killed on May 8, 2015. The only problem is, ladies and gentlemen, the phone they are trying to use was not Mr. Porter's phone.

And I anticipate, ladies and gentlemen, that at the conclusion of that case, I am going to ask all of you, all of you to come back with a verdict of not guilty of these charges. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Scharg.

Mr. Scharg?

MR. H. SCHARG: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon, your Honor.

As the attorney for Eugene Fisher, we have the opportunity to make an opening statement at this time, and

we will reserve that opportunity to address the jury at the conclusion of the government's proofs. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. I represent Devon Patterson. At this time we have the opportunity to make an opening statements, and we too reserve that until a later time. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

MR. FEINBERG: Good afternoon.

ALL JURORS: Good afternoon.

MR. FEINBERG: I am Jim Feinberg. I represent Robert Brown, II.

You heard the government give their opening statement. One of the first things it indicated is that there's lots and lots of charges. Most of the charges are redundant. They are the same charge with different titles.

It is the defense position that if the government says that Mr. Brown is guilty of the same crime with a different name over and over and over again, you will believe what the government says. In politics, it is very common to say the same thing over and over and over until the people start believing it.

It is the same thing in this case. Just because Mr. Brown is being charged with lots of different crimes, doesn't mean that it is true.

Also, one of the things that the government said that they will prove is that one of the acts in furtherance of the enterprise is the selling of drugs, and he used the words "they made tons of money." What you will not see on behalf of Mr. Brown is any proof by the government is that he had any money, that he lived a lifestyle where he was making tons of money.

Listen to what not only what the government is attempting to prove, the evidence, but also the lack of evidence that the government is not able to show.

Violence is one of the important areas of the enterprise. The government suggested that on June 7, 2006, Mr. Brown killed Cleo McDougal. He said that Mr. Brown was a fighter. He got the best -- Mr. McDougal got the best of him. He was bleeding, and that Mr. Brown went and got an AK-47 and was brought back to the scene by Mr. Murphy, Jonathan Murphy, who the government says you will now hear from Mr. Murphy that he was present when Mr. Brown killed Mr. McDougal.

Of course, the government didn't tell you that shortly after the murder, a person by the name Elroy Lucky Jones was arrested, charged with first degree murder and

went to trial in the state court and was found guilty. He was found guilty because witnesses testified that they saw Lucky Jones kill Mr. McDougal.

Well, after the first trial the case had to be set aside because the court reporter -- not Mr. DiBartolomeo, who I have known for more years than the two of us would admit -- the notes were lost. So they had to retry Elroy Lucky Jones, and what happened at the second trial? Lo and behold, he was convicted of first degree murder because of the evidence presented to the jury, and the jury found him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. But now Mr. Murphy comes forward and says, I was there. I saw Mr. Brown commit the murder.

What the government is not going to tell you or didn't tell you in their opening, the reason that Elroy Lucky Jones was convicted is that the brother of Mr. McDougal, who knew Elroy Lucky Jones for a long time, identified Lucky Jones as the killer. You can't get better identification than the brother of the decease who knew the shooter. But the government isn't satisfied with that identification. They are going to call Mr. Murphy.

What the government didn't tell you in their opening about Mr. Murphy, and what the defense is going to show you, is that Mr. Murphy testified at a prior hearing about the murder of Mr. McDougal. What did he testify to?

He testified that the reason he remembers everything is because Mr. Brown, when he had the AK-47 and was going to go kill Mr. McDougal, told Mr. Murphy, go take care of my son. Mr. Brown supposedly told Mr. Murphy, go take care of my son. So Mr. Murphy who knew his son since birth, went and got Mr. Brown's son the same day that the shooting occurred. What the government didn't tell you is that Mr. Brown's son was born two months later. His son wasn't born on June 7, 2006.

A cooperating witness generally is someone who is charged with a serious crime, sometimes the same crime that the defendants are charged with, and are facing 20 years, life, 30, huge numbers. They play "Let's Make a Deal." I confess he did it, and what happens when they make let's make a deal? They don't get life. They don't get 30. They don't get 20. They get a real good deal.

Now understanding that someone who is agreeing to do 10 years, 12 years, that's serious time, but nothing compared to what they were facing before the TV show "Let's Make a Deal," and the deal that they made was to safe themselves, and they are willing to say anything that is necessary to safe themselves.

Now Mr. Murphy says, I was with Mr. Brown when the shooting occurred. I was taking care of his son who didn't exist at the time. He says he was a witness to the

murder.

The prosecutor during questioning of the jury indicated to you this is not TV. Don't expect DNA or CSI. Well, let's take them for their word. They are not going to produce any crime scene investigation or DNA involving the shooting of Mr. McDougal.

Why is that important? The testimony was that Mr. Brown was suppose to have been beaten up and his face was bloody. Now blood has DNA. You get into fight with someone, you have the DNA on the person that you were fighting with. No DNA of Mr. Brown. No crime scene investigation showing that Mr. Brown was present. No hair. No DNA. No skin. Nothing, but this is kind of evidence that the government is going to say is sufficient for you to believe the evidence against Mr. Brown.

Same thing with the shooting of May 10, 2015.

There's no evidence at all other than let's make a deal of Mr. Brown being present when there was a shooting.

I think what the prosecutor says is 62 bullet holes in the car. No evidence whatsoever other than someone wanting to make let's make a deal to show that Mr. Brown participated or was even present during that shooting.

Mr. Spielfogel indicated the enterprise, the racketeering. Everything that Mr. Brown is being charged

with has to be part of the enterprise. Not himself. Not that he wanted to do something on his own, but that it was all part of the enterprise. There's no showing that Mr. Brown was part of the structure or hierarchy, even though he had been in the so-called Seven Mile Bloods for a long time. He wasn't an officer. There was no official capacity that Mr. Brown is alleged to be taken part of, and no proof that he ever participated in any organizational capabilities of the enterprise.

And again, they made tons of money according to the government, and that there it was sharing because it was part of the enterprise. There's no testimony at all that Mr. Brown made or shared in any proceeds of any of this alleged enterprise.

This is going to be a long trial. There are a lot of witnesses. When the witnesses come forward and attempt to testify against Mr. Brown, I want you all to listen carefully and say again, is this the kind of testimony, the kind of evidence that you would want a loved one who maybe facing trouble, to have that person testify against you or your love ones?

Consider the motive for them to lie, the motive for the government to bring them in to testify. They are not charging Mr. Brown with a crime and hoping for a verdict of guilty. They are putting four assistant U.S.

Attorneys, a helper -- a paralegal with their office, and Agent Ruiz who is a special agent, and again, all of these 150 witnesses. They are not putting all of them together just on an if come. They are hoping to convince you by all of this evidence that doesn't really bear belief in order to convict Mr. Brown of any crime.

At the conclusion of the case, we're going to go through the evidence, and we're going to go through the witnesses as to whether or not those witnesses should have any belief against Mr. Brown, and whether or not the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Brown is guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Feinberg.

Mr. Magidson?

MR. MAGIDSON: I will defer to Mr. Theis.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. THEIS: Good afternoon. I am John
Theis. Along with my co-counsel Mark Magidson, we
represent Arlandis Shy. Mr. Shy, we introduced to you
earlier, a couple of weeks ago when we chose the jury, the
gentleman seated over there.

I have good news. This is the last one of the opening statements that you're going to listen to, and I have better news in that having in listening to some of the other remarks that the other lawyers made, I have been

able to edit some of it out so I'm not repeating things that they said, because I think that would be something that would not be a good idea. I will try to do that, but there are some things that are so important and so critical to the decision making process that you will be involved with over next several weeks, that I do have to talk a little bit how they apply to Arlandis Shy.

As you know, we have been telling you -- and the Judge has told you again today -- about the burden that the government has of proving people guilty, and the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and the reason we talk about that, and the reason we bring it up so often is that it is proven to be the best way of making decisions about evidence, and determining whether the evidence proves somebody guilty beyond a reasonable doubt is to have the government introduce -- the burden of introducing that evidence, and that way we avoid making mistakes, because we all know that you want to get this right. Jurors, of course, want to make their decision the right way, and you will get instructions about what things you can consider.

But the words are not just legal words that we throw around. They mean something, and the reason for the last couple of hundred years, as proven to be the best way to decide cases, is that only by holding them to a high

standard of proof, can we make sure that the decision of someone, whether they are guilty or not, is the right thing.

The reason they are not going to be able to prove Arlandis Shy guilty of any offense in this case, any of the charged offenses of this case is because he is not guilty of being a racketeer. He is not guilty of being a member of a racketeering conspiracy. He is not guilty of any what they call substantive counts, the counts that you will hear evidence about, the events that they say that he participated in, and if they were, they would have sufficient evidence to prove it, but they don't, and they will not be introducing that evidence in this case.

Now the government told you today and earlier on in jury selection, that this isn't television, and one of the other lawyers mentioned it today. I think while you were sitting back there for hours, you must have realized that this must not be like television because there is a lot of time that these things take to introduce all of this evidence when you have number of defendants and a number of events that the government is going to introduce evidence about.

And when they said there's not going to be somebody running in with DNA that's going to prove somebody guilty, that to me diminishes the fact that, in

fact, there are resources that the government has that have developed over the years, scientific resources, techniques that do help determine whether somebody is guilty or not. Otherwise all trials would just be he said she said situation, and you would have to decide based on way the witness presented themselves, and what they said, whether they contradicted themselves or contradicted by other people. That would be the only way to determine whether somebody is guilty.

But there are things that the government can do, and the government told you this morning that when they got some of these witnesses who very frankly have a lot of baggage, who have said things that contradicts what they will say in court, who are themselves guilty of serious offenses, who made deals to avoid lengthy periods of time, and so the government says to you, but don't worry. We will be able to deal with it because we have evidence to corroborate what they say, and I'm telling you -- and I want you to listen -- hold me to what I say just like I want you to hold the government to what they say -- there will not be any such corroboration of any of the things that they are saying about Arlandis Shy.

They do have resources. They have got phone records. They've got text messages. They've got ballistics tests. They've got all sorts of things that

they now use, techniques. In fact, you will see some of them concerning other individuals in this case, but there's nothing about that with Arlandis Shy.

So when they tell you that it is not like TV and we don't have those things, they will introduce evidence like that, but not against the defendant, and I will talk to you a little bit about what the evidence I believe is going to show about Arlandis Shy, but first I would like to break down for you a little bit about what the allegations are against him and what he's charged with.

Like you heard the other lawyers, he is charged with participating in this racketeering conspiracy.

Basically they are going to try to tell you, and I think they said it today in opening, that if you're a Seven Mile Bloods, you're guilty of being in the racketeering conspiracy, and that's not the law, and you will be given the law at the end of this case, and you will decide whether Arlandis Shy's participation in this puts him in the racketeering conspiracy. Not just if hanging around with the Seven Mile Bloods, you must be guilty. That is not the law.

What you will hear is he, like the other defendants in this case, grew up in the neighborhood where he knew some of these people. Went to school with them. Hung out with them in the neighborhood. Saw them in the

community. Not all of them -- in fact, you will hear the government own witnesses tell you that Mr. Shy was not around a lot of the time. One of the government's main witnesses will say, I didn't see him that often. He isn't always present, and listen. When you're hearing the testimony about who is at specific places and times, a lot of the time Arlandis Shy is not around, but these are people that he knows, and he's not running away from his friendship with other individuals. He did know them, but some of this stuff goes back late 2000.

So to say that he's -- because he's hanging out with these people, of course, that's not enough to put him in the racketeering conspiracy.

But the government also alleges, in addition to charging him with conspiracy, they allege a participation and certain things called overt acts. The indictment in this case charges the racketeering conspiracy, and then alleges certain things that are called overt acts, and what that means is this, a conspiracy is just an agreement. It is two people agreeing to do something, and under most laws you have to do something more than just have an agreement. You have to do something to further that agreement.

So they charge in the indictment a number of what they call these overt acts, and they kind of give you a

road map as to where the government feels each one of the individuals is in participating in the case.

Well, the overt acts that they referred to as to Arlandis Shy, it starts with three drug cases or three situations where he is suppose to be around drugs. They are in 2009, two events in 2009, and a third event in 2008 back when he was a teenager, almost 10 years ago. That's what they have charged. This is proof that he was acting in furtherance of the Seven Mile Bloods racketeering conspiracy. They had to go back that far to find events to charge overt acts with regard to the drugs, and you may hear other testimony. I don't know what all of the witnesses are going to say. You may hear other testimony that he was had some contact with drugs later, but those are the only ones they set forth in this road map of overt acts.

There are a couple of other events that they also charged that actually did happen later than sometime a decade ago, and one of them is an event where they are alleging that he was in a car. He was driving a car, and another individual, the passenger in the car when they are driving away from a gathering, a party, they police come and try to stop them, and the passenger -- and the government's witness will say this. This is not just me telling you -- the government's witnesses will tell you

that the passenger threw a gun out of the car, and they charged that as something that is he has a driver of the car, when the passenger threw it out, that's an overt act in furtherance of conspiracy.

But most -- the most serious and most violent act charged with regard to Arlandis Shy occurred from May 8, 2015, and that is also not only an overt act, but that accounts for a number of the separate counts in the indictment that alleges his participating.

So I will spend a few minutes talking to you about that May 8, 2015 event because one, it was a serious act. It is murder, and other people were shot, and they have alleged that Arlandis Shy and two other people were in the car in which the shots were fired.

It may surprise you, I don't know, that there will be no witness who is going to come to court and testify that they saw Arlandis Shy in that car involved in that murder.

They are going to introduce, however, some of this physical evidence that I was talking about earlier to prove that individuals were involved with that murder and with that shooting. Not against Arlandis Shy, but it shows you that when they got the evidence, they can present it. They will show you texts between one of their witnesses and Billy Arnold, the guy that did the shooting,

or that they alleged did do the shooting. They will show you cell phone records, not of Arlandis Shy who voluntarily gave up his phone for them to check to see if there was any records of it. Nothing like that will be introduced.

They also obtained shell casings or bullet fragments that are later compared to a gun that was recovered from someone else involved in this case, not Arlandis Shy.

So they have physical evidence that will support the involvement of others. So they can do it when someone is involved.

So if there's nobody saying that he was an eyewitness saying that he was there participating in this, and there is no physical evidence to say it, how can they say that he was involved in it?

Well, you heard this morning the government telling you about another way they introduce evidence, and that is by making deals with people to get them to tell them what is happening, but even that, Derrick Kennedy, a convicted felon, drug dealer, who will testify is going to tell you that he got arrested. He was charged. He is facing big time as you heard, and he decides -- he and his lawyer talks to the government and say, if you give me x, I'll give you y, and what he gives them -- you know. They

just don't make a deal with you if you tell them what you did. You have to give them what somebody else did, and what he tells them is not I saw Arlandis Shy participate in this shooting, this murder. What he tells them is Arlandis Shy told me he did this, and you will hear about the circumstances where he says Arlandis Shy told him that he was one of the people that shot the guy.

When you hear all of that, and you listen to his testimony, and you hear all the reasons, things that if you were asked to believe this person out on the street, outside of this courtroom, in your community, in your work, wherever it is that someone is telling you something, you wouldn't believe a word what he said outside of this courtroom, but yet, they are going to get up and tell you now he is telling the truth.

When somebody tells you a story like that, you want some corroboration. You want something to say, hey. I will not base a conviction of something so serious as this without something to corroborate, and I suggest to you that is not going to be here in this case.

Those are what I call the substantive charges against him, that is, the shooting, all of those counts related to that shooting, and then you will see that there were other things, but they are all dependent of his participation in this so-called racketeering conspiracy

which the government will not be able to prove.

Because of the lack of evidence of his involvement however, I caution you to make sure that when listening to the evidence, and you're going through it and determining what to believe, what not to believe, whether something has been proven or not, do not be distracted by things that have nothing to do with somebody's guilt or innocence, and by that I mean, I suspect the government is going to introduce, as they've already talked about it, these rap videos, Facebook postings, things like that, that they will try to distract you and say, look at this shiny over here so you won't notice that the evidence is lacking over here.

Ask yourself, is this -- when they introduce this evidence, is this being introduced as proof, or is this being introduced to have you offended, insulted, bothered by what you're seeing in those videos so you think, these are bad guys? Why would they say things like that? Why would they rap about things like that?

This is not what -- what you're here for is not a judgment of the lifestyle of individuals. That is what they grew up with. That's what they are familiar with. That's what they like. You will see Arlandis actually participating as a rapper. This is what they do. It has nothing to do with the charges of this case.

This case involves allegations of specific misconduct, specific illegal acts, and whether the government has any evidence of it, and whether they've proven it. Do not be distracted. Do not decide that this is a judgment on their lifestyle.

Because they will not have any of that evidence, and will not be able to introduce any evidence of Arlandis' involvement of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, we will get up at the end of the case and ask you to present the only verdict that is going to be supported by evidence in this case on behalf of Arlandis Shy, and that's a verdict of not guilty.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Theis.

Ms. Finocchiaro, do you have a witness to get started with?

MS. FINOCCHIARO: Your Honor, at this time I believe there is still some preliminary matters that we have to address with both parties before we put on our first witness. This might be a good time to break for the day.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll do that. We've been sitting a long time, and during the course of the trial if you need to have a break or you are losing focus or need to use the facilities, just catch my attention.

We are using Judge Tarnow's courtroom, and he has these little cow bells, and he encourages jurors to ring the bell if they have to have a break. I don't think you will necessarily have to ring the bell. I will be happy take a break if you need it.

In the meantime, remember for the reasons that we've discussed earlier, you are not to talk about the case among yourselves or with others while serving on the jury. We will see you tomorrow, and I promise you that we will get started timely, if you're here timely.

(Jurors excused at 12:53 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ms. Finocchiaro, I'm not

exactly --

Honor.

MS. FINOCCHIARO: Give us one moment, your

MR. H. SCHARG: Judge, while you're waiting, I have three minor issues.

THE COURT: So Judge Tarnow has an afternoon hearing. We'll have to do it up in the our hearing room on 10. I'm not sure --

MR. WIGOD: Judge, I believe the parties talked earlier about deferring instructing the jury on the elements until after opening, meaning before we put on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony, which essentially is now or tomorrow morning. I think both parties agree that given everybody's opening, it would be -- and given the timing of everything that we're now in the midst of the trial -- to simply skip instructing the jury on the elements and go right to the proofs. THE COURT: I think that's a wise decision. I think at some point -- at any point during the trial if you wanted to revert to some instructions from the Court, I think we have this prerogative. As you indicated based on the openings, I think they have a pretty decent introduction to the charges and elements. So is that's agreeable to all the defendants? MR. DALY: Yes. MR. THEIS: Yes. MR. H. SCHARG: Yes. MR. FEINBERG: Yes. MR. S. SCHARG: On behalf of Mr. Porter, we agree. THE COURT: Okay. So I guess we're going to see Mr. Johnson and his client. Is it Mr. Waterstreet standing in plea? MR. WIGOD: Yes.

MR. H. SCHARG: I have a couple of things.

It is my understanding in the first trial, the government gave a list of witnesses in terms of sequence. There is 150 witnesses, 500 exhibits. I am not going to hold the government to the fire, but I would like at least a preliminary list each week, the Friday before the following week as to witnesses they plan on calling.

THE COURT: Did they do that weekly or was that the day before?

MR. H. SCHARG: I prefer the week before, and give me a grouping of the witnesses they plan on calling the following week rather than day before. One reason being is that there are some consultants that I have that I will need arrangements for traveling, and also to help me prepare for that week.

MR. SPIELFOGEL: We won't hold them to that, but at least it gives us a framework of what we need to do.

THE COURT: That makes sense.

MR. FEINBERG: I would also ask that at the conclusion of every day, what witnesses the government intends to call the following day.

MR. SPIELFOGEL: An update.

MR. THEIS: I think it helps things move smoothly. We know the government has issues with moving people around this case, probably more than usual, but it

helps if we know a week ahead and then an update the day before.

MS. FINOCCHIARO: Well, your Honor, I think given that things do move around, and we don't know how much cross there will be, and how long these witnesses will take, we'll start to get that as the trial goes along. I'm happy to give it to them a little bit in advance. I don't know a full week. Maybe the Friday before we give a rough estimate, and for any major witnesses, such as experts or anyone that they need a consultant for, we'll try to give as much advance notice as we can, and we're still working on our order ourselves.

So we told them that Agent Ruiz will likely be the first person. If he went on today, we gave them notice of 801(d)(2)(E) statements. So we will try to get them for the rest of the week.

MR. FEINBERG: Who is after Agent Ruiz?

MR. WIGOD: Detroit Police Officers. Part of the difficulty, we have no idea how long the defense attorneys will be with Agent Ruiz.

MR. H. SCHARG: It's our understanding each Friday, we'll get a list of possible witnesses that they are going to call the following week. They have reserved the right to add or change, but it will give us some indication of some of the witnesses that will be called.

MS. FINOCCHIARO: That's fine. 1 2 **THE COURT:** Okay. MR. S. SCHARG: May I address two issues? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 MR. S. SCHARG: We saw the video of 5 6 Mr. Bailey and his interrogation back in 2014, and on that 7 second video where he indicated there was seven core 8 members of the Seven Mile Bloods, I was wondering in order to -- is it possible to get the government to modify that 9 10 tape, and make it where Mr. Bailey is indicating that he 11 is Seven Mile Bloods and not mention anything about the 12 other members involved? I mean, they are able to change 13 make those six little slips possible. So I think it could 14 be worked out even --15 THE COURT: At what juncture do you expect the clips? How far in the trial? 16 17 MR. WECHSLER: Realistically a month. 18 work this out before then. The government is not ready to 19 agree with Mr. Scharg's request, but we can work it out. THE COURT: Okay. In that regard consult the 20 21 case log that talks about mutual terms. 22 MR. S. SCHARG: Lastly, your Honor, yesterday 23 when Mr. Bailey, at the conclusion of the -- before we 24 left for our break -- Mr. Bailey stood up and indicated

that he pointed to a couple members that were sitting -- a

25

Date

couple of defendants that were not Seven Mile Bloods, and 1 2 I think he pointed to my client, Mr. Porter. I just want the record to reflect that he did point to Mr. Porter, 3 indicating that he was not a Seven Mile Bloods, is that 4 5 correct Mr. Bailey? 6 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yes, that was correct, 7 your Honor. 8 MR. S. SCHARG: I just wanted the record to 9 reflect that. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 (Proceedings adjourned at 1:03 p.m.) 12 13 CERTIFICATION 14 I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court 15 reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed 16 pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States 17 18 Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the 19 above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. 20 21 I do further certify that the foregoing 22 transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction. 23 24 s/Ronald A. DiBartolomeo June 19, 2018

Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR

Official Court Reporter

25